# **Valley Center Community Planning Group**

Minutes for the March 8, 2010 Meeting

Chairman: Oliver Smith Vice Chairman: Anne Quinley Secretary: Deb Hofler

7:00 pm at the Valley Center Community Hall; 28246 Lilac Road, Valley Center CA 92082

A=Abs	sent/Abst	ain A/I=A P=Present	genda Iter	n BOS=F	Board of See TBD=To	upervisor	s DPLU=I	Departme	nt of Plani	ning and L	and Use	IAW=In A	ccordanc	e With
			pers: Ma			<u> </u>			andy don			mig Groc	ip 1–10a	
		April 12												
				r, Roll	Call by	Seat #	#, Pled	ge of A	llegiar	псе		07	:00	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
ANDERSON	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V I C K	BR ITSCH	R O B E R T S O N	Q I N L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L. E IW I S	H E R I G S T A D	S M I T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R - S T - A N S O N	B A C H M A N
Р	Р	Р	Α	Р	Α	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р		Р	Р	Р
Notes	: Rob	ertson i			as out o									
		T			Establi	shed: '	12					Yes	(X)	
	2		oval of											
					bruary 8	3, 2010	minute							
		na: Qui	inley/He	erigstad	<u> </u>			Carrie	es (Y-N	-A): 12	2 – 0 - 0	)		
Notes	3.	Onon	Farms	a. non	o opoka									
	).  .				e spoke		lia late	2 2 2 2 2						
<b>4</b>		March	5 <sup>th</sup> San	Diego I	k Items Planning	Comm	ission N	/leeting						
					ity proje									
		al) Nine PG members attended. They all did an excellent job. Thank you!! Orchard Run was approved on a technicality. They could not review it because pieces had been voted upon												
		previously and they could not vote again. They made minor changes to the landscaping and sound												
		walls. The Accretive project was not voted upon after public testimony. The PC decided to visit the Accretive site, North and South Villages and the Wood Valley Treatment Plant within 60 days. This												
								the Woo	od Valle	y Treatr	nent Pla	nt within	n 60 day	s. This
	.\				any may dates to			atad by	the reci	anation	of Brian	Moovo	r Torm	onde
0	)				didates									
					the par			, , , , , , , ,	C (Billot	<i>5</i> 11 <i>)</i> . 1110	olo wolc	, no oan	diddico.	***
С	c)				ember C			n.						
d	d)													
5	5.	Land	Use/Ad	ction It	ems:									
5	5.a.	P09-0	17, Majo	or Use	Permit,	Verizor	ո Wirele	ess Circ	le Ranc	h, 3033	0 Circle	R Lan	e, Valle	у

Discussion & Comments: applicant is Verizon Wireless; proposal to construct, operate and maintain an unmanned wireless telecommunication facility with a 45 foot monopole.

Center (Montross) - Continued

5.a.

P09-024, Major Use Permit for a wireless antenna monopole and associated mechanical 5.b. equipment, 26945 Valley Center Road, north of Ridge Ranch Road (Britsch) - continued

Discussion & Comments: applicant is Cricket Communications. Project contact is Franklin Orozco.

ZAP 03-011-02; Grand Paradise Reservoir; 27255 Kiavo Drive, Valley Center (Robertson) -5.c. continued

Discussion & Comments: modify ZAP by adding 8 panel antennas and 8 TMA's on existing monopole and 4 panel antennas and 4 TMA's on existing monopole owned by T-Mobile. The property contains 2 water tanks but the VC Water District does not allow antennas to be face-mounted to water tanks due to interference with maintenance. Applicant is ATT Mobility, LLC. Owner is Valley Center Municipal Water District; Project contact person is Karen Adler, PlanCom, Inc

5.d.

Report and possible motion and vote on report from sub-committee on GPA 04-006 Merriam Mountain Master Planned Community, located northwest of the 1-15/ Deer Springs interchange and within the North County Metropolitan Subregional and Bonsal Community Planning areas. (Montross)

**Discussion & Comments:** Should VCCPG take a position on the project based on its potential to serve as a precedent for projects in Valley Center? See subcommittee meeting report below presented by David Montross.

Sub Committee Meeting: March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2010

Present: Linda Bailey, Sandy Smith, David Montross

Linda Bailey gave us "overall" of project by providing a handout and discussion.

Linda showed artist renderings and layout of project.

Linda provided additional concept of incorporating a farmer's type market.

Linda discussed ideal construction start date of 2012 with residents and schools to open up in 2015.

We discussed the need for transportation from project to Escondido "possible new bus route".

We discussed providing space (or more space) for park and ride from project.

We came up with a list of questions that Linda will find answers for (see attached).

- 1. This project sets a precedent for other large general plan amendments in process along the I-15 corridor north from Escondido to the county line Meadowood, Campus Park, Campus Park West, Warner Ranch and Accretive. Together, these projects will add more than 22,000 people to the north county in addition to the general plan update. Merriam Mountain is the furthest along and approval of it will probably lead to the approval of the rest. If this had been known during the general plan process, Valley Center would not have had to add any more population or change any densities. If the county wanted all the new population along the I-15, they should have planned it there all along.
- 2. Since this project is not in the GPU, the project EIR study did not add all of the cumulative projects in the area, leaving out two of the Fallbrook projects and the Accretive project. The traffic study does not take into account all of the regional impacts on the I-15 or Deer Springs/Twin Oaks Valley. Therefore, their mitigation (widening the roads) will not be enough.
- 3. Since this project is not in the GPU, their upzoned density will not count in whatever equity mechanism program the county chooses to use. In Valley Center, the properties that lost density (down zoned) may not be compensated because not enough upzoned properties exist to pay into the program. The GPA projects outside of the GPU are the main reason there are not enough properties paying in.
- 4. Merriam Mountain has no employment center, schools or public transportation. All 9000 people will be auto-dependent. They should be required to have a large park and ride area and pay for a shuttle/bus to take people to the Sprinter and Escondido Transit Center.
- 5. Developing Merriam Mountain means blowing up mountains, filling in valleys and paving over a beautiful part of North County. All the state and local policies are focusing on putting new homes in the existing cities where the infrastructure is already located.
- 6. County services, such as fire, sheriff and other on-going services will be stretched even thinner due to the sprawl. Valley Center Services will be negatively impacted as the county will either need to cut services elsewhere or increase our taxes.

# Bonsal District - "Concerns"

Traffic

- Fire
- City of Vista current council members are writing letters against this project.
- Construction Work estimation
   It will take six years to remove dirt, rock, etc. "There will be blasting of five days per week"

# Deer Spring District - "Concerns"

- Traffic studies are inaccurate
- Escondido sprinter is five miles away
- **Fireboard** evacuation <u>Per Title 14</u> – Commuters must have safe civilian evacuation
- Trying to get approval before GP update
- **Deer Springs Road** needs major upgrade and haven't seen any plans for it

Presentation Joe Perring – project manager for Merriam Mountains. The northern portion would be dedicated to the MRCP. The project is located in the southern half. We believe that all of the requirements have been satisfied.

Rudolf – Have you heard about the request for a continuance to review the fire safety. Not at this point, and do not know when or if it will be granted.

Davis – Do you see similarities between your project and Accretives'? A: Discussed their timeline with the PAA, EIR, and GPA. They submitted their PAA in 2003.

Davis – These I-15 corridor projects have not been part of the GPU so their cumulative effects have not been included in the traffic studies. Comment? A: We did an exhaustive traffic study. We used the GPU model to do their traffic study with and without the project and the impact was the same. We looked from Hwy 76 to Hwy 78 to Vista.

Rudolf – Your project is not covered by the GPU? A: Our project is not part of the map or the GPU. Was the project required to comply with the guiding principles of the GPU? A: I believed our project complied. What other projects were included in the EIR? We studied Rancho Lilac, Passerelle Campus Park, Warner Rancho, Meadowood and Campus Park West projects. They did not meet the definition of cumulative projects and were not included.

Britsch – The project acreage? 2327 acres. What was the original project house number? About 400 homes. Building footprint is now 538 acres, MSRP is 1792 acres and the open space is the rest. It is now about 2700 homes.

Rudolf – What about the blasting and noise? The overall development will take place over a 10 - 15 year period. The first phase is the interchange and widening of Deer Spring Road – this will take one year. The intersection with take 2 years. The rest of the cut and fill, and blasting will take part on the other side of the ridgeline over a 10 - 15 year period. Will move 13.5 million cubic yards of dirt.

Christianson – What type of commercial development? Neighborhood retail and grocery. Also a fire station. Input from the Golden Door? They are very critical. If you added the other project, would Deer Springs need to be 6 lanes? A: I would argue that they would not. When we are finished, we will have 8000 ADTs extra. We will be rebuilding the signalized intersections.

Smith – Why was the other projects not considered as a whole? A: I will not/ can not answer that question.

Sewer – Will be from the Meadowlark plant or the Ensina plant in San Marcos.

Rudolf – How many homes will go in until the commercial area is built? A: Whenever the demand indicates that it should be built. There is general demand for commercial in this location.

Patsy Fritz – At the BOS mtg – Are you now processing the 2700 units or the 2700 minus the 77 units across from the Golden Door? A: The PC suggested that these be changed to 7 one acre lots. We have not decided yet. What is the commitment of building the fire station? Only after 4 of the 5 neighborhoods are built? A: We must build the fire station before the building permits for neighborhood 5 can be pulled. We have agreed to build

the 6000 sq ft fire station with a SC of Deer Springs Fire District before the 750<sup>th</sup> home, will contribute \$100,000.00 per year over 5 days. \$2.3 million fire mitigation fees – the money for building the fire station will come out of this. What is the LOS on Deer Springs Road after the project is finished? Los C/D

Hofler – Are you doing this project from start to finish? A: We only do the entitlements. We then send it to Newland to do the infrastructure, then individual building companies to do the home construction.

Rudolf – This is very concerning that this will set precedent up the I-15 corridor. This is a terrible place for what might be a good project elsewhere.

Davis – The impacts are not studied on the basis of all of the pending projects. This needs to be done.

Quinley – The magnitude of this project is inappropriate.

Herigstad – Why won't anyone bring us a project with large estates? Why does it has to be cookie cutter?

**Motion**: The PG authorizes the Chair to represent the 6 items that are issues that form our opposition to this project to the BOS before March 24, 2010.

A N D E R S O N	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V I C K	В R I Т S С H	R O B E R T S O N	Q U I N L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L. E IW I S	H E R I G S T A D	S M I T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R I S T I A N S O N	B C H M A N
Υ	Υ	Υ		Υ		Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ		Υ

Maker/Second: Smith/Quinley Carries (Y-N-A): 12 – 0 - 0

Notes:

5.e. Vote on letter from the VCCPG to DPLU concerning equine and other rezoning. (Davis and Quinley) - continued

**Discussion & Comments**: Letter originated in discussion of P-06-061 Tapestry Meadows Equestrian Center, Major use permit. TMEC located at 30673 Andreen Road. This is just a follow up of the letter that had already been sent but making it a more general rezoning.

5.f. Discussion and vote on Board of Supervisors letter concerning a Confined Animal Ordinance based on a model developed in San Mateo County. (Herigstad)

**Discussion & Comments**: Paul Herigstad: Spoke to Cheryl and she gave us an outline on how to do this. We need support of as many people and PGs as possible. Eric Lars (Farm Bureau) – suggested we get the letter in the hands of a BOS member.

Davis - Could we see the San Mateo model? A: I can e-mail the PG.

Rudolf – Do you like the ordinance in San Mateo county? A: I like most of it. When will the SC be finished with the draft ordinance? A: I just wanted to impart a sense of urgency on this group.

Quinley – Recommend that the SC come up with a draft ordinance that the PG can review and make a recommendation on.

5.g. Beauvais Tentative Map for Old Castle Project; 3100-5315 (TP5315RPLS); located on Old Castle Road near Red Mountain Drive (Bachman)

**Discussion & Comments**: 23 1/2 acres to be subdivided into 7 residential lots each with a minimum lot size of 2.0 acres. Owner is Wayne Beauvais, 1050 Maryland Drive, Vista; Contact is Jerry Gaughan 760-390-0197. The lots are a minimum 2 acre up to 7.8 acres. There is very little cut and fill. The lots are basically pad ready. We will have a trail, and widen the road. We are asking for a variance so that we will not have to underground the utilities on Old Castle. We will have to bond.

The PG approved the project in 2003 for 11 lots.

Rudolf – What are the findings to approve the TM? A: Consistent with the GPU and Community Plan.

Hofler – the Habitat is? A: It is aged chaparral. All steep slopes are dedicated open space. It is 22%.

**Motion**: To approve the 7 residential lots and one road lot, contingent on the approval of all mitigation efforts, and other standard conditions.

Υ	Υ	Υ		Υ		Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ		Υ	Υ	Υ
Make	Maker/Second: Bachman/Rudolf Carries (Y-N-A): 12 – 0 - 0													
Notes	Notes:													
5	Report from the General Plan Update Subcommittee and Planning Group vote on recommendations to DPLU on the following: "Consistency Zoning", proposed new Agricultural Zone and recommended GPLU Land Use Designations/Zones for three parcels North of the Cole Grade/Fruitvale intersection, Nelson Way, Bates Nut Farm and parcels													

west of Orchard Run and East of Brook Forest projects. (Rudolf)

**Discussion & Comments**: See Appendix A. for report. General Plan update is going forward per Rich Rudolf. DPLU has reviewed and approved VC GPU update to ensure that our real revised plan will be approved in January 2011. DPLU has returned with a report of its findings and recommendations. GPU S/C Report recommends: 1. Approve staff Table A suggested zoning changes to bring into consistancy with the proposed GPU Land Use designations, except the 5 noted; 2. Approve all the staff Table B recommended minimum lot sizes, for consistancy with the proposed GPU Land Use designations, and approve GPU S/C recommended interim minimum lot sizes for Conservation Subdivisions; and 3. Approve 4 GPU S/C recommended GPU Land use designation changes, to continue the iterative process reducing density and improving LOS within the Planning Area." Again Rudolph presented the file and GPU SC accepts the recommendations of staff with the most notable exception of:

- 1. Bates Nut Farm switched from Rural Commercial to Rural Residential and a major use permit will need to be pulled or possibly a special use zoning for that area only (S-90)
- Additional changes to the recommendations will be forwarded by Rudolph on the DPLU draft sent to VCCPG.

Hofler recused herself due to affecting of her property (Within 500' of her personal property)

Deb Hofler: – property next to the vet hospital and the vet. hospital itself, on Old Castle, have commercial zoning, why is the intent to return to residential? These properties have been commercial for a very long time (50+years). Hofler advises that she used to own one of the properties and the current zoning is C-40. Rudolph stated that staff has recommended that it be changed to rural residential. Concern with the RR designation.

Deb Hofler - The property on Cole Grade, north of Fruitvale (Hank Geise's place) is also currently C36, and has been for over 45 years. It should also stay Commercial.

Bill Crosby: properties that have been used for existing uses can be used until sold when new designation takes effect.

Discussion by group is that the reporting of the property could be incorrect. Hofler has direct knowledge that some of the areas that have been addressed are incorrect from what the county says. Group requests to have clarification of property types confirmed:

- 1. Area 10U: Veterinary Hospital to Rural Residential possibly C32 instead of C40
- 2. Area 3 A,B,C The three parcels south of Countryside Veterinary Hospital to be removed from the report to be reviewed and discussed.
- 3. Area 11U Nelson Wav

John Walker: Recommends that this is not done for the benefit of the property owner. Speaker recommends that all property owners check their specific property to ensure that the zoning is current.

Hope Goodwin – is there a place to get the information about the sub committee and the recommendations by staff? Rudolph – available online and in the library with at least 72 hours notice before any meetings.

	<b>Motion</b> : Pass 8 of the 12 recommendations by staff with the exception of the 3 items listed above to be resolved by staff with the current questions on the current zoning.													
A N D E R S O N	D A V I S	H O F L E R	V С К	вк−госн	R O B E R T S O N	Q U - Z L E Y	M O N T R O S S	L'E⊠-0	H E R I G S T A D	S M T H	V A C A N T	R U D O L F	C H R - S T - A N S O	B A C H M A N

													N	
Υ	Υ	Α		Υ		Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ	Υ		Υ	Υ	Υ
Make	Maker/Second: Rudolph / Quinley Carries/Fails (Y-N-A): 11-0-0													
Notes	Notes: Hofler recuses herself													
	Request for support of VCCPG for Project Wildlife to acquire, rehabilitate and conserve the historic CCC facility (previously the CDF fire station) for their regional headquarters (if not acquired, rehabilitated and conserved by VC Schools), with a possible vote. (Vick) – pulled.													

**Discussion & Comments**: The school district has first right of refusal. If they do buy the land, they will remove the buildings.

6.	Announcements & Items of Interest to the VCCPG:
a)	Please get your form 700 submitted, PG members.
7.	Subcommittee Reports & Business:
a)	Mobility – Christine Lewis, Chair.
b)	GP Update – Richard Rudolf, Chair.
c)	Nominations – Hans Britsch, Chair.
d)	Northern Village – Keith Robertson, Chair.
e)	Parks & Rec. – David Montross, Chair.
f)	Rancho Lilac – Ann Quinley, Chair inactive
g)	Southern Village – Jon Vick, Chair.
h)	Spanish Valley - Oliver Smith, Chair inactive
i)	Tribal Liason – Paul Herigstad, Chair.
j)	Website – Robert Davis, Chair.
k)	Pauma Ranch – Ann Quinley and Keith Robertson, Chairs inactive
l)	Castle Creek – Oliver Smith, Chair inactive
m)	Equine Rezoning – Paul Herigstad, Chair.
n)	Nelson Way Recycling Plant – Robert Davis, Chair inactive
8.	Correspondence Received:

- a. DPLU to VCCPG Old Castle Wireless Telecommunication Facility; Major Use Permit. Case number(s) 3300/10-0001 (P10-001); Environmental Log No.: ER10-02-001; Project address: 30641 Rolling Hills Drive, APN 120-170-07-00; KIVA Project 10-0121350 located at 30641 Rolling Hills Road. Consists of 35 foot tall mono-pine tree to which 12 panel antennas would be mounted. Associated equipment would include a back-up generator installed inside a sound house and equipment cabinets surrounded by a 10-foot tall concrete block wall. The proposed underground trench is approximately 200 feet in length and would be placed adjacent to the existing driveway. Contact Mark Linman 1113 Rolling Hills Drive, El Cajon, CA
- b. DPLU to VCCPG Preliminary Notice of Approval for Tentative Parcel Map No. 20966 Contact is Jerilyn Lagus, 13391 Anthony Ridge road, Valley Center. Project is a subdivision located at 13391 Anthony Ridge Road and consists of three parcels with a density of .5 per acre.
- c. San Diego County Planning Commission to VCCPG Preliminary and Final Agenda for Meeting, February 19, 2010 and March 5, 2010 at 9:00 AM at 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego.
- d. DPLU to VCCPG P09-020; 3300-09-020; ENV 09-02-009; (replacement) Rice Property AT&T Mobility, LLC; located at 10590 Couser Way at Couser Canyon Rd; MUP for a Cell Site; Applicant is AT&T Mobility, LLC; 5738 Pacific Center Drive, San Diego, Contact person is Karen Adler, PlanCom, Inc. 301 State Place, Escondido. A total of 12 antennas are to be mounted to a proposed 50' high monobroadleaf. The equipment cabinets are to be located in a proposed 36'8" by 8'8" by 8' high CMU equipment enclosure located at ground. Current use of Rice Property is as a single family residence.
- e. DPLU to VCCPG; POD 09-006, Solar Wind Energy Zoning Ordinance Amendment. A portion of the proposed amendment was directed by the Board of Supervisors at the February 25, 2009 meeting to allow for a new two tiered approach to Wind Turbines in the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed amendment will include new and revised definitions as well as a new renewable energy section which consolidates the solar and wind regulations.
- f. DPLU to VCCPG; Valley Center North Wireless Telecommunications Facility Generator Additional Site Plan; S10-003 (3500-10-003); ER: 10-08-003; Project Address: 28434 Cole Grade Road; APN 188-2600-67/68; Kiva Project: 10-0122289. Information: Ernie Courter, Meridian Telecom, 3838 Campus Drive, Suite 118; North Beach, CA. The project would authorize the installation of a 30 KW emergency generator with a 150 gallon fuel tank at an existing wireless telecommunications facility, which consists of a 60 foot high monopole. The generator would be surrounded on 3 sides by an 8 foot high concrete wall.

- g. DPLU to VCCPG; Notice of Public Hearing on March 5, 2010 at 9:00 AM; John Belanich is Applicant; Project is Orchard Run 3500-05-055 (STP), Log N. 95098-033F. Project is an appeal by the VCCPG of the Director's decision to approve Site Plan STP05-055. The Site Plan is required to satisfy conditions of the Tentative Map TM5087RPL and Specific Plan SP95-04 that were approved for single and multi-family development. Project is located at Lilac Road at Betsworth Road.
- h. San Diego County Traffic Advisory Committee to VCCPG; Requests for traffic regulations were reviewed by the San Diego County Traffic Advisory Committee (TAC) in December. The review considered the Speed Limit Posting from the Escondido City Limit northerly to a point 260 feet south of Banbury Drive in Valley Center. The Committee reconsidered the 60 MPH speed limit positing and deemed it best to leave this segment unposted and revisit after construction is completed.
- i. DPLU to VCCPG, Verizon Wireless Emergency Generator Addition; S10-003; ER 1008003; Project Address is 28434 Cole Grade Road, Valley Center, CA; Applicant is Ernie Courter for Verizon Wireless, 3848 Campus Drive, Suite 118, Newport Beach. Verizon Wireless is proposing the installation of a 30 KW diesel powered emergency generation that will allow for uninterrupted service during unplanned power grid interruptions, natural disasters and other emergency situations. Generation will operate during power interruptions and once a week for about 10 minutes on a regular maintenance and testing program during normal business hours. Noise will be approximately 65dba at the property line and meets the County's noise ordinance requirements. The diesel powered generator measures 3'2"wide and 7'11" long and 6'2" tall including the 135 gallon fuel tank. It will be placed on a pre-fab concrete pad with a built-in retention curb that protects against spillage and leakage. It will be screened from view and fully enclosed within an eight foot high precase concrete wall.

9.	Requests for Items on Upcoming Agendas:									
a)										
10.	Motion to Adjourn: Next meeting April 12, 2010									
	Maker/Second: by default	Vote: 12 – 0 - 0								
Notes: Adjou	Notes: Adjourned at 10:10 pm / Motion to extend meeting for 10 minutes by Rudolf/?									

# Appendix A: To: VCCPG

From: GPU Subcommittee

Re: Recommended Comments on Consistency Zoning and GPU Land Use Designations

Date: March 8, 2010

#### Recommendations:

- 1. Approve the below list of Zoning Recommendations to be consistent with the Revised GPU (Planning Commission Tentative Approval November 2009 and February 2010), and forward them to Devon Muto ASAP.
- 2. Approve the staff-proposed Minimum Lot Size Changes, plus the interim position on Conservation Subdivision minimum lot sizes, below
- 3. Approve the below Land Use Map Changes, as part of your previously recommended Project Alternative to be included in the Revised GPU.

#### Discussion:

1. Zoning Recommendations: See Attachment 1 hereto, 1/8/2010 letter to Planning Group requesting our Comments on staff's proposed Zoning Consistency Review.

The GPU Subcommittee (vote: 5-0-0) recommends your approval of all the suggested changes in Table A thereto, except the following:

A. Area 3U (North Village VR 10.9 and VR 15): RU (group homes not allowed) or RV (group homes allowed). (vote: 5-0-0) Require a B Designator, which would require a Site Plan Review by the Valley Center Design Review Board.

- B. Area 9U (South of Betsworth RL-20): (vote: 5-0-0) Change this area to "Holding Area (S-90)," instead of proposed new AR Zone. "Holding Area" would require a Major Use Permit for any use until the community and DPLU create a specialized zone for this area. This would allow consideration of future zoning of the "Brook Forest/EDCO" parcels as Open Space (major pieces of the PAMA for the MSCP).
- C. Area 10U: (A-frame, Veterinarian parcel): (vote: 6-0-0) Change the General Plan Land Use Designation from Rural Commercial to Rural Residential; if not changed, recommend C32 Convenience Commercial Zoning, instead of staff-recommended C40 Rural Commercial
- D. Area 11U: (Nelson Way): Current use: concrete and asphalt recycling; local complaints of dust and noise; (vote: 5-1-0, Washburn No) Recommend Change Proposed GPU Land Use Designations from Limited and Medium Impact Industrial (I-1 or I-2) to Semi-Rural Residential SR=10 , and SR-10 Zoning, instead of staff-recommended General Impact M54.
- E. Area 12U: (Bates Nut Farm; Existing 10 acres of Rural Commercial, asking for additional 7 acres of C40 to the east.) (vote: 6-0-0) Recommend "Holding Area (S-90)," instead of staff-proposed C40 Rural commercial. Staff says ANY change in use there will probably trigger a required amendment to the existing very old MUP. Subcommittee's previous recommendation was a compromise based in incomplete information from both owner and staff.
- 2. Minimum Lot Size Changes. (vote: 6-0-0) Approve staff's recommendations in Table B to Attachment 1. Adding accessory buildings by right is an example of something dependent on minimum lot size. The State's Affordable Housing Density Bonuses would override any minimum lot size requirements.

  Regarding the Conservation Subdivision Program, staff has now additionally requested VCCPG input on minimum

lot sizes there. (vote: 6-0-0) The subcommittee recommends that the VCCPG respond with the following table as our interim response.

#### **INSERT CHART**

The VCCPG should provide additional advice to DPLU after the GPU S/C presents further recommendations, based on more review of specific areas within the Planning Area which may be appropriate for Conservation Subdivisions. One size may not fit all.

# 3. Land Use Map Changes

In March 2009 you approved recommending density reductions, supporting the Draft Land Use Map outside the Villages, and the Environmentally Superior Map inside the Villages, plus reductions within the central valley villages to match those proposed by the two major developers in the North Village. In August 2009, you approved the "VCCPG Recommended Alternative Map", making additional reductions as part of the "iterative process" right-sizing the Villages.

Recommendations: Reduce the Revised GPU Land Use Designations:

- A. On the 3 parcels north of Fruitvale/Cole Grade road intersection: (vote: 6-0-0) from VR-4.3 to VR-2
- B. Area 10U: (A-frame, Veterinarian parcel): (vote: 6-0-0) from Rural Commercial to Rural Residential
- C. Area 11U: (Nelson Way) (vote: 5-1-0, Washburn No) from Limited and Medium Impact Industrial (I-1 or I-2) to Semi-Rural Residential SR=10
- D. Area 12U: (Bates Nut Farm; (vote: 6-0-0) from Rural Commercial to Rural Residential

Tonight's recommended changes continue that iterative process, further reducing density on 3 lots north of Fruitvale, south of Hofler's Vet Clinic, and east of Cole Grade. (For those, and the area west of Orchard Run, outside the South Village, the subcommittee previously simply ran out of steam, and did not look at closely, in earlier recommendations). The recommendations to replace Rural Commercial and Industrial outside the Villages with Semi-Rural or Rural Residential would continue reduction of our excessive, unsustainable, Commercial acreages, as well as substantially improve the LOS on our roads.

We have not included any recommendations as to the staff's proposal to collapse the 3 existing Agricultural Zones into one. Staff has received negative feedback from other groups, and is revisiting the concept. We emphasized the need for modifications that would encourage horse keeping and boarding.

# **CONCLUSION**

The impact of these (and the previously approved recommended reductions) should improve the livability of the North Village, and improve the LOS on Valley Center and Lilac Roads. The shrinking of the Village Limit Line to that shown on the Environmentally Superior Map inside the Villages, with these additional changes, will bring us ever closer to the 33,000 population goal.

Moreover, we anticipate returning to you again on the population issue. The DPLU staff report to the Planning Commission for its 2/19/2010 GPUpdate included a population White Paper, further fine-tuning the county-wide population goal. Instead of 666,000 (no part of which is required to placed in any particular community within the county), it is now 616,000. This should forever eliminate any discussion of "transferring" density from the central valley Villages to the agricultural western part of our Planning Area.

# **Population of Valley Center**

Since the beginning of the General Plan Update process in the late 1990's, the population goals have been in flux. The table below recaps the different population numbers for Valley Center and the County totals throughout the GPU process.

	BOS	2002	Referral	Hybrid	Draft	Environ	VCCPG
	1998	Working					Recommended
		Copy					Alternative
North			4129	4187	4187	2376	1849
Village							
South			4099	3949	3949	2739	2297
Village							
VC	33,000	38,300	39,320	38,590	37,460	30,690	33470
County	660,731	678,500	678,270	670,370	669,140	641,070	674,188

Respectfully submitted,

Rich Rudolf

Chairperson

**GPU** Subcommittee